




PATENT

EXPRESS MAIL NO. EV328618202US

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

CERTIFICATE OF EXPRESS MAILING

I certify that the documents referred to as enclosed herein are being deposited on 24 Nov 2003, with the U.S. Postal Service as Express Mail No. EV328618202US under 37 C.F.R. 1.10 and are addressed to Mail Stop Patent Application, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450.

  
R. Haferkamp  
Reg. No. 29,072

In re application of:  
Indeck et al.

Serial No.: Not Yet Assigned

Filed: Herewith

For: Associative Database Scanning And  
Information Retrieval

:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:

Examiner: Not Yet Assigned

Group Art Unit: Not Yet Assigned

Mail Stop Patent Application  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

PETITION TO MAKE SPECIAL

This Petition to Make Special is being submitted in accordance with MPEP §708.02 VIII – Accelerated Examination, based upon the following:

1. This petition is being submitted in compliance with this subsection.
2. All of the claims are directed to a single invention, based on the fact that this is a continuation application from a parent application where the first 42 of these same claims were originally presented and the Office failed to enter a restriction requirement. Thus, the Office has already determined that the claims submitted herein are for a single invention.
3. A search has been made by a foreign patent office, the EPO in processing the corresponding PCT application containing the first 42 claims as are presently included in the

subject application. Furthermore, the US Patent Office has already searched these first 42 claims in the parent US application. For the Office's convenience, a copy of the published PCT application including the Search Report is attached.

4. A copy of the references found in the EPO search have been previously made of record in the parent US application and are thus not required to be re-submitted.

5. In compliance with this subsection, Applicant has already submitted amendments to the Office with a detailed discussion and explanation of the patentability of the present claims over the most relevant prior art references cited and relied upon by the Office in the examination of the parent. Copies of these amendments are already of record in the parent US application are attached hereto for convenience.

With respect to the additional references cited in the EPO search and not relied upon by the Office in the parent, Applicant wishes to make the following remarks.

The EPO search identified as an "X" reference for many of the claims an article entitled "Hardware Systems for Text Information Retrieval" authored by Lee A. Hollaar, published in 1983, and more particularly page 5, column 1, line 15 and page 6, column 2, line 22. First of all, it is noteworthy that this reference is directed towards text searching and neither discloses or suggests that its techniques are applicable to searching other databases, including analog databases. Indeed, the EPO search did not cite this reference against any of the claims covering the invention's use in searching an analog database.

With respect to the applicability of the reference against the claimed invention as used to search in the digital domain, the searching methodologies taught in the reference fail to disclose or suggest, inter alia, the "approximate matching" feature of the present invention and instead relies on "exact matching" of less than an entire key against a target data value in order to determine whether a match has occurred. More particularly, as stated in the present application beginning at page 7, line 34, "Approximate matching in this [digital] domain corresponds to performing comparisons or digital correlation of the digital key with digital source data obtained from the storage medium. . . . The success of an approximate match may be determined by setting a correlation value or by using one of a number of matching performance metrics such as the number of bits within a key that are equal to the corresponding bits in the scanned source data. . . . For clarity, when the word 'match' is used, the reader should understand that it could be either of the two searches described above

as approximate searches, . . . " Also, see the passage at page 12, line 27, which states "This type of comparison and correlation may be referred to as a pattern match or comparison."

Thus, the claims that recite the present invention in terms of "an approximate matching and pre-fetch processor" (claims 1, 20, 22, 42), or a "matching circuit for making a pattern comparison" (claims 12, 18, 21, 23, 31), or "a matching circuit for comparing and correlating" (claim 34), or a "programmable logic device configured to determine whether a pattern match exists" (claim 43), or "a programmable logic device configured to determine whether an approximate match exists" (claim 50), or "a retrieval device configured to determine whether an approximate match exists" (claim 53), or "a retrieval device configured to determine whether a pattern match exists" (claim 77) all are patentable over the Hollaar reference as requiring a correlation function neither disclosed or suggested by Hollaar.

The Office is respectfully requested to grant this petition and expedite the examination of this application.

Respectfully submitted,



R. Haferkamp  
Reg. No. 29,072  
Thompson Coburn LLP  
One US Bank Plaza  
St. Louis, Missouri 63101  
(314) 552-6000  
(314) 552-7000 (fax)